


F

389

B 68



THE NATIVE TRIBES ABOUT THE EAST TEXAS MISSIONS

BY

HERBERT E. BOLTON, Ph. D.

Adjunct Professor of History in the University of Texas

Reprinted from the Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association,
Vol. XI, No. 4 (April, 1908)

AUSTIN, TEXAS

J383
B68

Reprinted from the Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association,
Vol. XI, No. 4, pp. 249-276 (April, 1908).

THE NATIVE TRIBES ABOUT THE EAST TEXAS MISSIONS.

HERBERT E. BOLTON.

INTRODUCTORY.

The history of the Spanish *régime* in the Southwest is very largely the history of an Indian policy in its military, political, and religious phases, and to understand it aright it is manifestly necessary to know something of the people over whom the Spaniards extended their authority and upon whom they tried to impose their faith and their civilization.

The purpose of this paper is to furnish a partial introduction to the early history of the Spaniards in eastern Texas—the scene of their first systematic activities between the Mississippi and the upper Rio Grande—by presenting some of the main features of the organization of the compact group of tribes living in the upper Neches and the Angelina River valleys, the first and the most important group with which they came into intimate contact. These tribes furnished the early field of labor especially for the Franciscans of the College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro, who worked for fifteen years in the region and founded in it five missions, while one was founded there and maintained for more than half a century by the College of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zaca-tecas. It is hoped that this paper will throw new light on the all too obscure history of these interesting establishments, particularly with respect to their locations.¹

The Names "Texas" and "Hasinai."

The tribes in question commonly have been called the Texas, but more properly the Hasinai. Concerning the meaning and

¹The authoritative presentation of the general history of the beginnings of these establishments is that contained in the excellent articles by Dr. R. C. Clark, published in this journal, Vol. V, 171-205, and Vol. VI, 1-26. In their bearings upon Indian organization and tribal names they are marred to some extent by the use of corrupt copies of the sources instead of the originals, as will be seen by comparing them with what follows. It is but fair to state that in the revision and extension of these articles, about to appear as a Bulletin of the University of Texas, Mr. Clark has corrected some of the errors.

For facts concerning the individual tribes mentioned in the course of this article, see the *Handbook of American Indians*, edited by F. W. Hodge (Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology, No. 30, Part I, 1907; Part II in press).

usage of these terms I shall only present here somewhat dogmatically part of the results of a rather extended study which I have made of these points and which I hope soon to publish.¹

The testimony of the sources warrants the conclusion that before the coming of the Spaniards the word Texas, variously spelled by the early writers, had wide currency among the tribes of eastern Texas and perhaps over a larger area; that its usual meaning was "friends," or more technically, "allies"; and that it was used by the tribes about the early missions, at least, to whom especially it later became attached as a group name, to designate a large number of tribes who were customarily allied against the Apaches. In this sense, the Texas included tribes who spoke different languages and who were as widely separated as the Red River and the Rio Grande. It seems that the Neches-Angelina tribes designated did not apply the term restrictively to themselves as a name, but that they did use it in a very untechnical way as a form of greeting, like "hello, friend," with which they even saluted Spaniards after their advent. I may say, in this connection, that the meanings "land of flowers," "tiled-roofs," "paradise," etc., sometimes given for the name Texas, I have never seen even suggested by early observers, or by anyone on the basis of trustworthy evidence.

The name Texas has been variously applied by writers, but it was most commonly used by the Spaniards, from whom the French and the English borrowed it, to designate those tribes of the upper Neches and the Angelina valleys, and this in spite of their knowing full well that among the natives the word had the wider application that has been indicated. There are many variations from this usage in Spanish writings, it is true, but this, nevertheless, is the ordinary one. As a tribal name the term was sometimes still further narrowed to apply to a single tribe. When this occurred, it was most commonly used to designate the Hainai, the head tribe of the group in question, but sometimes it was applied to the Nabadache tribe. As a geographical term, the name Texas was first extended from these Neches-Angelina tribes to their immediate country. Thus for the first quarter of a century of Spanish occupation, the phrase "the Province of Texas" referred only to the country east of the Trinity River; but with the founding of the San Antonio settlements the term was extended westward, more in harmony

¹The present paper embodies some of the results of an investigation of the history of the Texas tribes which the writer is making for the Bureau of American Ethnology.

with its native meaning, to the Medina River, and then gradually to all of the territory included within the present State of Texas.

While the name Texas, as used by the tribes in the eastern portion of the State, was thus evidently a broad and indefinite term applied to many and unrelated tribes occupying a wide area, it is clear that the native group name for most of the tribes about the missions in the Neches and Angelina valleys was Hasinai, or Asinai.¹ Today the term Hasinai is used by the Caddoans on the reservations to include not only the survivors of these Neches-Angelina tribes, but also the survivors of the tribes of the Sabine and Red River country. It seems from the sources, however, that in the early days the term was more properly limited to the former group. In strictest usage, indeed, the earliest writers did not include all of these. A study of contemporary evidence shows that at the first contact of Europeans with these tribes and for a long time thereafter writers quite generally made a distinction between the Hasinai (Asinai, Cenis, etc.) and the Kadohadacho² (Caddodacho) group; these confederacies, for such they were in the Indian sense of the term, were separated by a wide stretch of uninhabited territory extending between the upper Angelina and the Red River in the neighborhood of Texarkana; their separateness of organization was positively affirmed, and the details of the inner constitution of both groups were more or less fully described; while in their relations with the Europeans they were for nearly a century dealt with as separate units. Nevertheless, because of the present native use of the term and some early testimony that can not be disregarded, I would not at present assert unreservedly that the term formerly was applied by the natives only to the Neches-Angelina group. If, as seems highly probable, this was the case, in order to preserve the native usage we should call these tribes the Hasinai; if not, then the Southern Hasinai.

The name Hasinai, like Texas, was sometimes narrowed in its application to one tribe, usually the Hainai. But occasionally the notion appears that there was an Hasinai tribe distinct from the

¹The Spaniards ordinarily spelled this name Asinai or Asinay, and the French writers Cenis. Mooney, the ethnologist, who knows intimately the survivors of these people living on the reservations, writes the name by which they now call themselves Hasinai, or Hasini, preferably the former. His spelling has been adopted as the standard one by the Bureau of American Ethnology. See the *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, 1092 (1896).

²I use here also the spelling adopted by the Bureau of American Ethnology.

Hainai. This, however, does not seem to have been the case. As now used by the surviving Hasinai and Caddos, Hasinai means "our own folk," or, in another sense, "Indians."¹

Ethnological Relations: Historical Importance.

The Hasinai belonged to the Caddoan linguistic stock. This family, which was a large one, was divided into three principal geographic groups of tribes: the northern, represented by the Arikara in North Dakota; the middle, comprising the Pawnee confederacy, formerly living on the Platte River, Nebraska, and to the west and southwest thereof; and the southern, including most of the tribes of eastern Texas, together with many of those of western Louisiana and of southern Oklahoma.² Of this southern group the tribes about the Querétaran missions were one of the most important subdivisions. They, together with the related Caddo tribes to the north, represented the highest form of native society between the Red and the upper Rio Grande rivers, a stretch of nearly a thousand miles. This fact gave them from the outset a relatively large political importance. While it has been clearly shown by writers that the immediate motive to planting the first Spanish establishment within this area was French encroachment, little note has been made of the fame and the relative advancement of the Hasinai Indians as factors in determining the choice of the location. LaSalle's colony, which first brought the Spaniards to Texas to settle, was established on the Gulf coast; and had the natives of this region been as well organized and as influential among the tribes as the Hasinai, and, therefore, as likely to become the theater of another French intrusion, the logical procedure for the Spaniards would have been to establish themselves on the ground where the first intrusion had occurred, and within relatively easy reach from Mexico both by water and by land. But the Karankawan tribes of the coast proved hostile to the French and Spaniards alike, and, while their savage life and inhospitable country offered little to attract the missionary, their small influence over the other groups of natives rendered them relatively useless as a basis for extending Spanish political authority. These considerations entered prominently into

¹See Mooney, *op. cit.*

²Powell, "Indian Linguistic Families," in the *Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, with map; *Handbook of American Indians* (Bureau of American Ethnology, Bul. No. 30), 182.

the Spaniards' decision to establish their first Texas missions far in the interior, at a point difficult to reach from Mexico by land and wholly inaccessible by water. Events justified their estimate of the importance of the Hasinai as a base of political operations. But, while the control of these tribes and their Caddo neighbors remained for a century or more a cardinal point in the politics of the Texas-Louisiana frontier, it was soon learned that the less advanced and weaker tribes of the San Antonio region, nearer Mexico and farther removed from the contrary influence of the French, afforded a better field for missionary labors.

THE PRINCIPAL TRIBES.

Since Indian political organization was at best but loose and shifting and was strongly dominated by ideas of independence, and since writers were frequently indefinite in their use of terms, it would not be easy to determine with strict accuracy the constituent elements of this Neches-Angelina confederacy at different times. However, a few of the leading tribes—those of greatest historical interest—stand out with distinctness and can be followed for considerable periods of time.

De León learned in 1689 from the chief of the Nabadache tribe, the westernmost of the group, that his people had nine settlements.¹ Francisco de Jesus María Casañas, writing in 1691 near the Nabadache village after fifteen months' residence there, reported that the "province of Aseney" comprised nine tribes (*naciones*) living in the Neches-Angelina valleys within a district about thirty-five leagues long. It would seem altogether probable that these reports referred to the same nine tribes. Those named by Jesus María, giving his different spellings, were the Nabadacho or Yneci (Nabaydacho), Necha (Neita), Nechaui, Nacono, Nacachau, Nazadachotzi, Cachaé (Cataye), Nabiti, and Nasayaya (Nasayaha).¹ The location of these tribes Jesus María points out with some definiteness, and six of them at least we are able to identify in later times without question. Moreover, his description of their governmental organization is so minute that one feels that he must have had pretty accurate information. The testimony of a number of other witnesses who wrote between 1687

¹"Poblaciones." Letter of May 18, 1689, printed in Buckingham Smith's *Documentos para la Historia de la Florida*; evidently that cited by Velasco, in *Memorias de Nueva España*, XXVII, 179. Concerning the *Memorias*, see note 3, p. 256.

²Relación, August 15, 1691, MS., 107, 108, 112.

and 1692 in the main corroborates that of Jesus María, particularly in the important matter of not including the Nasoni tribe within the Hasinai.¹

It so happens that after 1692 we get little intimate knowledge of the Hasinai until 1715. When light again dawns there appear in common usage one or two additions to Jesus María's list. Whether they represent an oversight on his part or subsequent accretions to the group we can not certainly say. Of those in his list six, the Nabadacho, Neche, Nacogdoche, Nacachau, Nacono, and Nabiti are mentioned under the same names by other writers. Cachae is evidently Jesus María's name for the well known Hainai, as will appear later, while the Nabiti seem to be San Denis's Nabiri and may be Joutel's Noadiche (Nahordike). For the Nechaui we can well afford to accept Jesus María's explicit statement. Besides these nine, the Spaniards after 1716 always treated as within the Hasinai group the Nasoni, Nadaco, and the Nacao. Judging from the localities occupied and some other circumstances, it is not altogether improbable that two of these may be old tribes under new names, as seems to be clearly the case with the Hainai. The Nasayaya, named by Jesus María, may answer to the Nasoni, well known after 1716,² and the Nabiti may possibly be the Nadaco, also well known after that date. If both of these surmises be true, we must add to Jesus María's list at least the Nacao, making ten tribes in all; if not, there were at least eleven or twelve. Putting first the best known and the most important, they were: the Hainai, Nabadache, Nacogdoche, Nasoni, Nadaco, Neche, Nacono, Nechaui, Nacao, and, perhaps, the Nabiti and the Nasayaya. This is not intended as a definitive list of the Hasinai at any one time,

¹See Joutel, in Margry, *Découvertes*, III, 341, 344, *et seq.* (French's version of Joutel's Journal, printed in the *Historical Collections of Louisiana*, is very corrupt, and must be used with the greatest care); Terán, Descripción, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 48, *et seq.*

²The Nasayaya are placed by Jesus María in a location corresponding very closely to that later occupied by the Nasoni. Yet, the facts that though Jesus María named the Nasoni he did not include them in the Hasinai group while he did include the Nasayaya, and that Terán explicitly excludes the Nasoni from the Hasinai, make it seem probable that the Nasoni and the Nasayaya were distinct. The strongest ground for rejecting this conclusion is the fact that the latter tribe never appears again under a recognizable name, unless they are the Nacaxe, who later appear on the Sabine. The Nabiti might possibly be the Nadaco, but this does not seem likely, for the locations do not correspond very closely, while as late as 1715 San Denis gave the Nabiri and Nadoco as two separate tribes.

but it does include those known to have been within the compact area about the Querétaran missions and commonly treated as within the Hasinai group. By following the footnotes below it will be seen that "Nacoches," "Noaches," and "Asinay," which have been given, with resulting confusion, as names of tribes where early missions were established, are simply corruptions of "Neché," "Nasoni," and "Ainai," as the forms appear in the original manuscripts, whose whereabouts are now known.

The Ais, or Eyeish, a neighbor tribe living beyond the Arroyo Attoyac, at whose village a Zacatecan mission was founded in 1717, seem to have fallen outside the Hasinai confederacy. Only recently have they been included by ethnologists in the Caddoan stock, and, although they are now regarded as Caddoan, there are indications that their dialect was quite different from that of their western neighbors, while their manners and customs were always regarded as inferior to those of these other tribes.¹ Moreover, there is some evidence that they were generally regarded as aliens, and that they were sometimes even positively hostile to the Hasinai. Thus Jesus María includes them in his list of the enemies of the Hasinai; Espinosa, a quarter of a century after Jesus María wrote, speaks of them as friendly toward the "Assinay," from which by implication he excludes them, but says that the Hasinai medicine men "make all the tribes believe that disease originates in the bewitchment which the neighboring Indians, the Bidais, Ays, and Yacdocas, cause them," a belief that clearly implies hostility between the tribes concerned,² while Mezières wrote in 1779 that the Ais were hated alike by their Spanish and their Indian neighbors.³

The Adaes, or Adai, in whose midst the mission of Nuestra Señora de los Dolores was founded in 1717, lived beyond the Sabine, and belonged to the Red River group of Caddoans, or the Caddo. They, therefore, do not fall within the scope of this paper.

THEIR LOCATION.


For determining the location of these tribes our chief materials are the Journal of Joutel (1687), the Relación of Francisco de

¹On the subjects of their languages see the *Handbook of the American Indians*, under "Eyeish."

²*Crónica Apostólica*, 428.

³Expedición, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 240.

Jesus María Casañas (1691), De León's diary of the expedition of 1690, Terán's for that of 1691-2, those of Ramón and Espinosa for the expedition of 1716, Peña's for that of Aguayo (1721), Rivera's for his *visita* of 1727, Solís's for that made by him in 1767-8, and Mezières's accounts of his tours among the Indians in 1772, 1778, and 1779. Two only of these are in print, while two of them have not before been used.¹ Besides these and numerous supplementing documentary sources, there are (1) the



early surveys showing the Camino Real, or Old San Antonio Road, whose windings in eastern Texas were determined mainly by the

¹Of the diaries of De León and Espinosa I cite only the manuscripts in the Archivo General y Público, Mexico. These, I believe, are not otherwise available, and have not before been used except by Mr. R. C. Clark, who has recently had access to my transcripts. Of Jesus María's Relación I follow an autograph manuscript, which, however, appears to be a copy instead of the original. Of the diaries of Terán and Ramón I have had access to the originals, and of the Mezières manuscripts either to the originals or to certified official copies. My copy of the Rivera diary is from the edition printed in 1736. For the Peña and Solís diaries I have had to depend upon the copies in the *Memorias*. On comparing *Memorias* transcripts, in general, with the originals I have found that they are very corrupt and that numerous mistakes have resulted from their use. But in cases where there are no essential differences, I cite the *Memorias* copies, because they are more generally accessible; otherwise I cite the originals.

location of the principal Indian villages where the Spaniards had settlements, (2) certain unmistakable topographical features, such as the principal rivers and the Neche Indian mounds, and (3) geographical names that have come down to us from the period of Spanish occupation.

It will be interesting, before studying the location of each one of the tribes separately, to read the general description of the group given by Jesus María in 1691. Speaking of the Great Xinesi, he said, "To him are subject all of these nine tribes: The Nabadacho, which, for another name, is called Yneci. Within this tribe are founded the mission of Nuestro Padre San Francisco and the one which I have founded in Your Excellency's name, that of El Santísimo Nombre de María. The second tribe is that of the Necha. It is separated from the former by the Rio del Arcangel San Miguel [the Neches]. Both are between north and east.¹ At one side of these two, looking south, between south and east, is the tribe of the Nechauri, and half a league from the last, another, called the Nacono. Toward the north, where the above-mentioned Necha tribe ends, is the tribe called Nacachau. Between this tribe and another called Nazadachotzi, which is toward the east, in the direction of the house of the Great Xinesi, which is about . . . half way between these two tribes,² comes another, which begins at the house of the Great Xinesi, between north and east, and which is called Cachaé. At the end of this tribe, looking toward the north, is another tribe called Nabiti, and east of this a tribe called the Nasayaha. These nine tribes embrace an extent of about thirty-five leagues and are all subject to this Great Xinesi."³ This description will be convenient for reference as we proceed.

It may be noted here that the average league of the old Spanish diaries of expeditions into Texas was about two miles. This should be kept in mind when reading the data hereafter presented.

¹Meaning north and east of the point where he was writing, near San Pedro Creek, Houston County, as will appear below.

²My text (see note 3, p. 256) may be correct here. It reads "q esta, Como almediodia y enel Medio de las dos Naciones." It is possible that the copyist first wrote *almediodia* by mistake for *enel Medio de* and then wrote the latter correctly, but neglected to erase the words written by mistake. Other data seem to bear out this supposition.

³Relación, 107-108.

The Nacogdoche Tribe and the Mission of Guadalupe.

A starting point or base from which to determine the location of most of the tribes is the founding of the mission of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe at the main village of the Nacogdoches in 1716, for it can be shown that this mission remained on the same site until it was abandoned in 1773; that the modern city of Nacogdoches was built at the old mission site; and, therefore, that the location of this city represents the location of the principal Nacogdoche village. The evidence briefly stated is as follows: Ramón, whose expedition founded this mission, wrote in his *Derrotero* that nine leagues east-southeast of the principal Hasinai village (the Hainai), on the Angelina River, he arrived at the "village of the Nacogdoches," and that on the next day he "set out from this mission," implying clearly that the mission was located where he was writing, at the Nacogdoche village.¹ As is well known, all of the missions of this section were abandoned in 1719 because of fear of a French invasion. Peña reports in his diary of the Aguayo expedition of 1721 that Aguayo, who rebuilt the abandoned missions, entered "the place where stood the mission of N. S. de Guadalupe de Nacodoches," and rebuilt the church. The inference is that the site was the old one, more especially since in one instance in the same connection where a mission site was changed Peña mentions the fact.² This mission was continued without any known change till 1773, when it was abandoned. But when in 1779 (not 1778, as is commonly stated) Antonio Gil Ybarbo laid the foundations of modern Nacogdoches with his band of refugees from the Trinity River settlement of Bucareli, he found the Nacogdoches mission buildings still standing, settled his colony near them, and apparently reoccupied some of them.³ Hence it is clear that the city of Nacogdoches represents very closely, perhaps exactly, the site of the main village of the Nacogdoche tribe at the opening of the eighteenth century. If more

¹Derrotero, original in the Archivo General y Público, Mexico. The copy in *Mem. de Nueva España*, Vol. XXVII, is very corrupt. At this point a generous addition is made by the copist. See folio 158.

²Peña, *Diario*, *op. cit.*, XXVIII, 40, 43, 44.

³Antonio Gil Ybarbo to Croix, May 13, 1779, MS. See Bolton in *THE QUARTERLY*, IX, No. 2, for the story of the beginning of modern Nacogdoches.

evidence were necessary, the presence within the city of Nacogdoches till recent times of four ancient Indian mounds would strengthen the conclusion.¹ With this as a starting point, it is not difficult to indicate the approximate location of the most prominent of the remaining tribes. Starting with the Nacogdoche involves the disadvantage of reading the diaries backwards, it is true, but has the great advantage of enabling us to proceed from a well-established point.

The Hainai Tribe and the Mission of Concepción.

On the east bank of the Angelina River, a little north of a direct west line from the Nacogdoche village, was that of the Hainai.² This tribe, whose lands lay on both sides of the Angelina,³ was the head of the Hasinai confederacy, and for that reason was sometimes called Hasinai. It is to this tribe, also, that the name Texas was usually applied when it was restricted to a single one. Within its territory was the chief temple of the group, presided over by the great Xinesi, or high priest.⁴ At its main village the mission of La Purísima Concepción was founded in 1716.

After the *Relación* of Jesus María, our first sources of specific information on the location of this village are the diaries. Ramón tells us that he entered the "Pueblo de los Ainai" just east of the Angelina River, and that nine leagues east-south-east of this village he reached the "Pueblo de los Nacogdoches."⁵ The

¹Information furnished in 1907 by Dr. J. E. Mayfield, of Nacogdoches. He writes: "Four similar mounds once existed at Nacogdoches, located upon a beautiful site about three hundred yards northeast of the old stone fort or stone house that has recently been removed from the main city plaza. . . . These have been razed and almost obliterated. To the east of them is a hole or excavation from which the earth may have been taken for the construction of these mounds."

²I follow the spelling of Mooney, which has been adopted by the Bureau of American Ethnology. The more common Spanish forms were Aynay and Ainai. English writers frequently spell it Ioni.

³Espinosa, *Crónica Apostólica*, 425; *Diario*, 1716; MS. entry for July 12; Mezières, *Carta*, *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 241.

⁴Jesus María, *Relación*; Espinosa, *Crónica Apostólica*, 423.

⁵Derrotero, entries for July 7 and 8. Original in the Archivo General y Público, Mexico. The copy in *Memorias de Nueva España* (XXVII, 157-8) changes "Ainai" to "Asinay" and "Nacogdoches" to "Nacodoches." It is such errors as the former, evidently, that gave rise to the idea that

missionary fathers who accompanied Ramón, in their Representation made at the same time reported the distance as eight leagues east-south-east. Peña (1721) says the distance was eight leagues east-north-east from the *presidio* founded near the mission, and nine from the mission. Rivera (1727) found the mission just east of the "Rio de los Aynays," or the Angelina, and nine leagues west of the Nacogdoches mission.¹ These witnesses tally in the main with each other and also, be it noted, with the testimony of the San Antonio Road, as its route is now identified in the old surveys. According to the best information obtainable it ran from Nacogdoches a little north of west to the Angelina, passing it about at Linwood Crossing.² Espinosa tells us that he founded the mission of Concepción a mile or two east of the place where the highway crossed the Angelina, near two springs, in the middle of the Hainai village. This site could not have been far from Linwood Crossing.³

This Hainai tribe, as has been stated, was evidently the one which Jesus María called the Cachaé or Cataye. He said that between the Nacachau and the Nacogdoche, about midway, was the lodge of the Great Xinesi, and—if we get his meaning here—that immediately northeast of this lodge was the Cachaé tribe. From other data we learn that the Xinesi's house was within or on the borders of the Hainai territory, about three leagues from the Concepción mission, and apparently west of the Angelina.⁴ The Cachaé thus correspond, in location and relations, to the Hainai, while, moreover, the latter are the only tribe that appear in this locality after 1716. Considering with these facts the probability that Jesus María would hardly have left the head tribe unmentioned in so formal a description as is his, and the fact that

there was an Asinay tribe. Similarly, the *Memorias* copy of the Representación of the "Padres Misioneros" dated July 22, 1716 (Vol. XXVII, 163) states that the mission of Concepción was founded for the "Asinays," whereas the original of that document, as of Espinosa's diary, reads "Ainai." This error has been copied and popularized.

¹Ramón, Derrotero, in *Memorias de Nueva España*, XXVII, 158; the "Padres Misioneros," Representación, *Ibid.*, 163; Peña, *Diario*, *Ibid.*, XXVIII, 43-44; Rivera, *Diario*, leg. 2142.

²Maps of Cherokee and Nacogdoches counties (1879), by I. C. Walsh, Commissioner of the General Land Office of Texas, compiled from official data.

³Espinosa, *Diario*, entries for July 6 and 7; Ramón, Derrotero, *op. cit.*

⁴Espinosa, *Crónica Apostólica*, 424; Morff, *Mem. Hist. Texas*, Bk. II, MS.

the Hainai is clearly the head tribe, it seems reasonably certain that the Cachaé and the Hainai were identical.

The Neche Tribe and the Mission of San Francisco (Second Site).

Southwest of the Hainai village, nearly straight west of the Nacogdoche, was the Neche village, near the east bank of the Neches River, and near the crossing of the Camino Real. The diaries usually represent the distance from the Neche to the Hainai as about the same as that from the Hainai to the Nacogdoche—some eight or nine leagues.¹ The air line distance was evidently somewhat less in the former case than in the latter, but the route was less direct, since between the Neches and the Angelina rivers the road bowed quite decidedly to the north. The usual crossing of this highway at the Neches, as now identified, was at Williams's Ferry, below the mouth of San Pedro Creek.² Archaeological remains help us to identify this crossing and give certainty to the approximate correctness of our conclusions. These remains are the Indian mounds east of the Neches River. The first mention of them that I have seen is that by Mezières, in 1779. His record is important. Passing along the Camino Real on his way to the Nabadache, he noted the large mound near the Neches River, raised, he said, by the ancestors of the natives of the locality "in order to build on its top a temple, which overlooked the pueblo near by, and in which they worshiped their gods—a monument rather to their great numbers than to the industry of their individuals."³ This mound and its two less conspicuous companions still stand in Cherokee County about a mile and a half from

¹Espinosa tells us that the mission was near a spring and also near an arroyo that flowed from the northeast. He gave the distance from the mission from the camp near the Neches River as one league, and that to the mission of Concepción, east of the Angelina, eight leagues, going northeast by east, then east (Diario, entries for July 2 and 6). Ramón gave the distance to the mission of Concepción, from the camp near the Neches apparently, but possibly from the mission, as nine leagues east-northeast (Derrotero, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 157-158).

²See maps cited above, and also the Map of Houston County, copied from a map by Geo. Aldrich, by H. S. Upshur, Draughtsman in the General Land Office, 1841.

³Letter to Croix, August 16, 1779, MS., in the Archivo General y Público, Mexico. This letter was written at the "Village of Sn. Pedro de los Navedachos," just after Mezières passed the mounds. The *Memorias* copy of the letter gives the name of the place, erroneously, San Pedro Nevadachos" (Vol. XXVIII, 241).

the river and five miles southwest of Alto, in a plain known to some as Mound Prairie, undoubtedly the true Mound Prairie whose whereabouts has been debated. They are on land now the property of the Morrill Orchard Company, once a part of the original grant made to the romantic Pedro Ellis Bean. The Old San Antonio Road, as identified in the oldest surveys, ran about three hundred yards north of the largest, which is also the northernmost mound.¹ This mound, standing by the old highway, is an important western landmark for the location of the early tribes and missions, just as the site of Nacogdoches is an important eastern landmark. With the evidence of these mounds, the name San Pedro attached to the creek joining the Neches just above the crossing, and the early maps of the Camino Real, there is no doubt as to the approximate location of the old crossing, and, consequently, of the sites of the Neche and the Nabadache villages, with their respective missions, on opposite sides of the river.

The mission of San Francisco de los Texas, reestablished in 1716 at the Neche village,² appears from the diaries to have been some one or two leagues—from two to four miles—from the crossing. Peña's diary puts it at two leagues. The entry in his diary for August 3, 1721, is as follows: "The bridge [over the Neches] having been completed, all the people, the equipage, and the drove, crossed in good order, taking the direction of east-northeast, and camp was made near the mission of San Francisco, where the *presidio* was placed the second time it was moved in 1716. The march was only two leagues."³ Rivera gives the distance from the crossing as more than a league.⁴ The other diaries are indefinite on this point, but the conclusion is plain that the mission and the

¹Information furnished by Dr. J. E. Mayfield, of Nacogdoches. The original Austin map (1829) in the Secretaría de Fomento, Mexico, shows the mound on the north side of the road.

²On the authority of the corrupt copy of Ramón's itinerary in the *Memorias* (XXVII, 157) it has been stated that this mission was founded at the "Nacoches" village, a tribal name nowhere else encountered. The original of the itinerary, however, gives the name "Naiches," thus agreeing with the other original reports and clearing up a troublesome uncertainty. The official name of the mission was San Francisco de los Texas, but, because of its location at the Neche village, it came to be called, popularly, San Francisco de los Neches.

³Diary, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 38. The *presidio* had been temporarily placed in 1716 on the west side of the Neches, near a small lake, and then moved across the river.

⁴Rivera, *Diario*, 1727, leg. 2140.

Neché village were close to the mounds, the mission, at least, being apparently farther from the river.

The Nabadache Tribe and the Mission of San Francisco (First Site).

The westernmost tribe of the group was the Nabadache. The main village was a short distance—perhaps six miles—west of the Neches River, above the crossing, near a stream that early became known as San Pedro, and at a site that took the name San Pedro de los Nabadachos. It is this name San Pedro, in part, that has caused some persons to think, groundlessly, that the first mission of San Francisco was founded at San Antonio.

The exact point at which the main Nabadache village stood I can not say, not having examined the locality in person, but certain data enable us to approximate its location pretty closely.

First is the testimony of the diaries and other early documents. De León reported in his itinerary (1690) that from the camp half a league from the Nabadache chief's house to the Neches River, going northeast, it was three leagues.¹ The site examined on the river at this point was deemed unsuitable for the mission "because it was so far out of the way of the Indians"; consequently the mission was established close to the camp "in the middle" of the village.² In their reports to the home government Massanet and De León seem to have stated that the mission was some two leagues from the Neches;³ while Terán in 1691 reported it to be only a league and a half from the Mission of Santísimo Nombre de María, which was evidently close to the Neches.⁴ Jesus María and Espinosa said that the village was about three leagues from

¹Entry for May 26. He recorded the distance going and coming as six leagues.

²De León, Derrotero, entry for May 27; Massanet, Letter, in *THE QUARTERLY*, II, 305.

³This is an inference from the instructions given in 1691 to Terán and Salinas, which required them to examine the large stream two leagues, more or less, from the village where the mission of San Francisco had been established the year before. (Ynstrucciones dadas, etc., January 23, 1691, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 19; Ynstrucción que han de observar el Capp. D. Gregorio Salinas, etc., April 13, 1691. Archivo General, Provincias Internas, Vol. 182. This document has not before been used.)

⁴See note 2, page 266.

this river, the former adding that it was right across the stream from the Neche tribe.¹ Joutel and Ramón called the distance from center to center of the two villages about five leagues.² In comparing these estimates with those that follow we must remember that it was somewhat further from the village to the crossing of the river than to the river at its nearest point, for as early as 1691 it was found that the best crossing was down stream a league or more.³ Keeping these things in mind, it may be noted that Peña's diary makes the distance from San Pedro to the crossing four leagues. In his entry for July 27, 1721, he says, "The Father President F. Ysidro Felix de Espinosa went ahead with the chief of the texas, who wished to go to arrange beforehand the reception *in the place where the first mission had been.*" In his entry for the next day he says, "Following the same direction of east-northeast, the journey was continued to the place of S. Pedro . . . *where the Presidio and Mission had been placed (for the Spaniards did not go beyond this point) in the year '90.*" Here the reception was held, and presents were made to Aguayo by the Indians of the "ranchos which are near by," the point being, according to Peña's diary, fifteen leagues northeast from the crossing of the Trinity,⁴ and four from the crossing of the Neches, passing by the site of the *presidio* as it was first established in 1716. Rivera's diary makes the distance from San Pedro to the crossing something over four leagues, or six to the mission on the other side. His record is interesting. He writes, on August 5, "I camped this day near a prairie which they call San Pedro de los Nabidachos, formerly occupied by Indians of the tribe of this name, but at present by the Neches tribe, of the group of the Aynays, head tribe of the Province of Texas." His next entry begins, "This day, the sixth, . . . continuing the march in the same direction [east-one-fourth-northeast] I traveled six leagues, crossing the Rio de los

¹Relación, 2, 6.

²Relation, in Margry, *Découvertes*, III, 341-344; Ramón, Derrotero, *op. cit.*

³Terán, Descripción y Diaria Demarcación. *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 47, 61.

⁴Diario, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 34-35. The Italics are mine. It may be noted that Peña and Rivera give quite commonly shorter leagues than the others.

Neches. At more than a league's distance from it I found some huts where a religious of the Cross of Querétaro resides, destined . . . to minister to these Indians . . . with the name of San Francisco de Nechas," that is, the mission having this name.¹ Solís, going northeast in 1767, tells us that San Pedro de los Nabadachos was beyond the San Pedro River. He may possibly have meant that it was on the north side, but I am inclined to think that he meant that it was east of one of the southern branches.²

Our inference from the diaries would thus be that the first site of the mission of San Francisco, in the village of the Nabadache, was from one and a half to three leagues—from three to six miles—distant from the Neches River at its nearest point, a league or more farther from the crossing, and still another league—in all some ten miles—from the Neches village on the other side of the river.

The information of the diaries is here supplemented by geographical names and the old surveys of the Camino Real or the San Antonio Road. San Pedro Creek, which joins the Neches River in the northern part of Houston County still bears the name that was early given to the vicinity of the Nabadache village and the first mission of San Francisco. This occurred as early as 1716 from the fact that Espinosa and Ramón celebrated the feast of San Pedro there. The celebration took place at a spot which, according to both Ramón and Espinosa was thirteen leagues northeast of the crossing of the Trinity.³ That the name was continuously applied to the place until after the middle of the eighteenth century is sufficiently established by the citations already made. To show its continued use thereafter there is an abundance of evidence.⁴

¹Rivera, *Diario*, leg. 2140. Ramón's Derrotero makes the distance four leagues from San Pedro to his camp near the Neches or to the mission site across the river, but it is not clear which, although the former is probably his meaning. (*Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 155-157.) Ramón's Representación makes the distance between the first mission of San Francisco, and the second of this name, at the Neche village, five leagues. *Ibid.*, 159.

²*Diario*, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 279.

³Ramón, Representación, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 159. Ramón and Espinosa, *Diaries*, entries for June 29-30.

⁴See Ramon, Derrotero, and Espinosa, *Diario* (1716), entries for June 29-30; Peña, *Diario* (1721), in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 34; Rivera, *Diario* (1727), leg. 2140; Ereción de San Xavier, 5 (1746); De Soto Vermudez, Investigation (1752); Solís, *Diario*, in *Mem. de Nueva*

Next comes the testimony of the Camino Real, or the Old San Antonio Road. There seems to be no good topographical reason why this old highway should not have run directly from Crockett to the Neches at Williams's Ferry, and the long curve to the north between these points must be explained as a detour to the Nabadache village and the missions located nearby. The surveys represent this highway as running always south of San Pedro Creek, never crossing it, but definitely directed toward it at a point some six or eight miles west of the Neches crossing.¹ The point corresponds closely to that designated in the diaries. Near here, quite certainly, were the Nabadache village and the first mission of San Francisco, while not far away, but nearer the Neches, was the second mission established in that region, that of El Santísimo Nombre de María, founded about October, 1690.²

The Nacachau, Nechawi, and Nacono Tribes.

Across the Neches from the Nabadache, only a few leagues away, and adjoining the Neche tribe on the north, was the relatively little known tribe called by Jesus María the Nacachau, and by Hidalgo the Nacachao. We have seen that Jesus María described the Neche tribe as being separated from the Nabadache only by the Neches River. Later he says, "Toward the north, where the above-mentioned Necha tribe ends, is that called the Nacachau." The Neche and Nacachau villages were thus close together. Near them the second mission of San Francisco was founded in 1716. Ramón says that the mission was founded in the village of the Naiches,

España, XXVII, 279; Mezières, Cartas (1778-1779), in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 270; Cordoba to Muñoz, December 8, 1793. Béxar Archives, Nacogdoches, 1758-1793. It may be noted that while the post-office village of San Pedro preserves the name of the general locality, it is too far west to answer to the site of the mission of San Francisco and the Nabadache village.

¹See Upshur's map, cited above.

²This mission was close to or on the bank of the Neches River. According to Terán's itinerary (1691) it was a league up stream from the crossing and a league and a half northeast of the mission of San Francisco (Descripción, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, 45, 47, 61; Jesus María said that it was on the bank of the river (Relación, 104).

and the "Padres Misioneros" say that it was for the "Naicha, Nabeitdâche, Nocono, and Nacâchao."¹

Southeast of the Neche and the Nabadache villages, according to Jesus María, were two villages half a league apart, called the Nechaui and the Nacono. Of the Nechaui we do not hear again, but from Peña (1721) we learn that the Nacono village, which he called El Macono, was five leagues below the Neches crossing. This would put the Nechaui and the Nacono villages five leagues down the Neches River, perhaps one on each side.²

The Nasoni Tribe and the Mission of San José.

Above the Hainai, on the waters of the Angelina, were the Nasoni. Joutel, in 1687, reached their village after going from the Nabadache twelve leagues eastward, plus an unestimated distance north. Terán, in 1691, found it twelve leagues northeast of the Neche crossing below the Nabadache village.³ The founding, in 1716, of a mission for this tribe and the Nadaco gives us more definite data for its location. The missionaries who took part in the expedition, in their joint report, called the distance from the Hainai to the Nacogdoche eight leagues east-southeast, and that from the Hainai to the Nasoni mission seven northeast. Peña, who called the former distance nine leagues east-northeast, esti-

¹Jesus María, Relación, 1691, 107-108; Ramón, Derrotero (1716), in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 158; Padres Misioneros, Representación (1716), *Ibid.*, 163; Peña, Diario (1721), *Ibid.*, XXVIII, 38-41; Rivera, Diario (1727), leg., 2140; Bonilla, *Breve Compendio*, 1772, in *THE QUARTERLY*, VIII, 35, 38. As I have indicated above, the *Memorias* copy of Ramón's itinerary states that the mission was founded in the village of the "Nacoches," a miscopy for "Naiches." The map on page 256 was made before I discovered this error in the copy, which I had first used. My opinion now is that, with this correction, the sources would not be violated by placing the Nacachau tribe somewhat farther north than I have there represented it.

²Jesus María, Relación, 108; Peña, Diario, *op. cit.*, 36.

As the Nacono visited Aguayo on the west side of the Neches, I have represented the village on that side in my map. Of course, the reason is a very slight one.

Espinosa in his diary says that the Nasoni mission was founded for the Nacono, but this seems to be a form of Nasoni, for by others it is uniformly called the mission of the Nasoni or of the Nadaco, or of both. See, Hidalgo, letter to Mesquia, October 6, 1716, in the Archivo General.

³Joutel, Relation, in Margry, *Découvertes* III, 337-340; Terán, Descripción, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 47-48.

mated this as eight north. Espinosa put it at seven northeast.¹ Thirty years later Espinosa said that the mission was founded in the Nasoni tribe and ten leagues from mission Concepción.² This increase in his estimate of the distance may be due to lapse of time and his long absence from the country.

The direction of the Nasoni mission from that of Concepción was, therefore, evidently northeast, and the distance about the same, perhaps a trifle less, than that to the Nacogdoche village.

Espinosa, who in 1716 went over the route from the Hainai to the Nasoni to establish the mission of San José recorded in his diary that on the way there were many Indian houses (*ranchos*), and that the mission was situated "on an arroyo with plentiful water running north." We must look, therefore, for a point some fifteen or more miles northeast of the Hainai on a stream running northward. These conditions would be satisfied only by one of the southern tributaries of Shawnee Creek, near the north line of Nacogdoches County. In this vicinity, clearly, was the Nasoni settlement in 1716. It seems not to have changed its location essentially since it had been visited by Joutel and Terán, a quarter of a century before, and it remained in the same vicinity another third of a century, for in 1752 De Soto Vermudez found the Nasoni village eleven leagues northward from the Nacogdoches mission.³ The mission of San José remained near the Nasoni until 1729, when, like those of San Francisco, at the Neche village, and Concepción, at the Hainai village, it was removed to San Antonio.

The Nadaco.

For the rest of the tribes in this group our information is less definite. The Nadaco, though a prominent tribe, can not be located with certainty until 1787, when they, or at least a part of them, were on the Sabine River, apparently in the northern part of Panola County.⁴ But in 1716 they were clearly near the Nasoni,

¹Padres Misioneros, Representación, 1716, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 163; Peña, Diario, 1721, *Ibid.*, XXVIII, 44; Espinosa, Diario, 1716, entry for July 10.

²*Crónica Apostólica*, 418.

³Investigation, 1752, MS.

⁴Francisco Xavier Frago, Diary, in the General Land Office, Austin, Texas, Records, Vol. 68, p. 174.

and sometimes the two tribes seem to have been considered as one. Hidalgo, who must have known, for he was on the ground, distinctly states that the mission of San José was founded for the Nasoni and the Nadaco.¹ Although the mission was commonly known to the Spaniards as that of the Nasoni, the French writers, in particular, including San Denis, sometimes called it the Nadaco² mission. Frequent references made by La Harpe in 1719 to the Nadaco show that he is either speaking of the Nasoni or of a tribe in their immediate vicinity, more probably the latter, since in other instances the tribes are so clearly distinguished. For instance, he tells us that when at the Kadohadacho village on the Red River, not far from Texarkana, "they assured me that sixty leagues south was the village of the Nadacos, where the Spaniards had a mission, and that they had another among the Assinai, in the Amediche [Nabedache] tribe, which was seventy leagues south-one-fourth-southwest from the Nassonites [which were near the Kadohadacho]."³ In 1752 the Nadaco were only a short distance

Sancroft Library

¹Letter to Mesquia, October 6, 1716, in the Archivo General de Mexico, MS. The *Memorias* copy of Ramón's itinerary (XXVII, 158) calls this mission that of the "Noachis," but the original reads plainly "Nasonis."

²Thus, La Harpe noted in his journal that San Denis, who conducted the expedition of 1716 that founded the missions "proposed, sometime after his arrival, that he should be the conductor of nine missionaries to the tribes of the Adayes, Ayches, Nacocodochoy, Inay and Nadaco" (Extrait du Journal manuscrit du voyage de la Louisiane par le sieur de La Harpe et de ses découvertes dans la partie de l'Ouest de cette colonie, in Margry, *Découvertes*, VI, 194). San Denis himself regarded the mission as having been founded in the Nadaco tribe. This is the inference from a correspondence carried on in 1735-1736 between him and Sandoval, governor of Texas. Sandoval wrote to San Denis on March 10, 1736, acknowledging a letter of December 2, 1735, in which San Denis outlined the basis of French claims to country west of the Red River. Judging from Sandoval's summary of the letter (I have not seen the letter) he alleged that, with Bienville, he had explored the country as far back as 1702; that in 1715 he had journeyed from the "Asinai" to Mexico, seeing on the way only vestiges of the old Spanish settlements; that he conducted Ramón into the country, "the result of which was the foundation [of missions], which it was requested of your lordship should be established among the Nacogdoches, Nadaco, Ainais, and Naicha, and the subsequent ones among the Ays and Adais, maintaining the ministers of the Gospel at your expense." (Triplicate of Sandoval's letter, in the Archivo General, Sección de Historia, Vol. 524, formerly in Indiferente de Guerra. With this letter there are several original letters of San Denis.

³La Harpe, *Relation du Voyage*, in Margry, *op. cit.*, VI 262. See also *Ibid.*, 266.

northward from the Nasoni, apparently northeast, and the two tribes then had a single chief.¹

Supposing the Nadaco and the Nasoni to have lived in clearly distinct settlements at the early period, the Nadaco could hardly have been near the highway from the Nasoni to the Kadohadacho, for, as we have seen, the Nasoni always figure as the last station on the way to the Kadohadacho. It seems more probable, considering this last fact with the statements made about the mission of San José, that the two tribes lived in a settlement practically continuous, to which sometimes one and sometimes the other name was given. An upper branch of the Angelina is now called Anadarko (Nadaco) Creek, and it is possible, in spite of the above considerations, that this stream was the home of the Nadaco at the coming of the Spaniards and the French, but it seems more probable that it was applied in later times as a result of the removal of the tribe to that neighborhood.

It is clear, at any rate, that in the early eighteenth century the Nadaco village was very near that of the Nasoni.

Other Tribes.

Of the location of remaining tribes we know even less than of the last, and can only record the few statements made of them by the early writers. Three leagues west of the Nasoni Joutel entered the village of the Noadiche (Nahordike)² who, he said, were allies of the Cenis, and had the same customs. This location corresponds with that assigned by Jesus María to the Nabiti, and the tribes may have been identical. The site designated was apparently west of the Angelina River and near the southwestern corner of Rusk County. Similarly, the Nasayaya, put by Jesus María east of the Nabiti, may possibly have been the Nasoni. If they were a separate tribe they must have been in the same neighborhood. If separate, too, they early disappear from notice, unless possibly they may be the Nacaxe, who later are found in the same latitude, but farther east. All that we can say of the location of the Nacao is that they were northward from the Nacogdoche, and probably closer

¹This is on the well-founded assumption that the Nadote discussed by De Soto Vermudez were the same as the Nadaco (De Soto Vermudez, Investigation, MS.).

²Relation, in Margry, *op. cit.*, III 388.

to the Nacogdoche than to the Nasoni, since they were attached to the Nacogdoche mission. A reasonable conjecture is that they were in the neighborhood of Nacaniche Creek, in Nacogdoches County.¹

Thus, with varying degrees of precision and confidence, we are able from a study of the documents to indicate the early homes of the tribes usually included in the Hasinai group. Five of the sites, at least, are reasonably well established, and these are historically the most important, for they were the sites of Spanish establishments, while the others were not. I refer, of course, to the villages of the Nabadache, Neche, Hainai, Nacogdoche, and Nasoni. A careful examination of the topography of the country and of the archaeological remains would doubtless enable one to verify some and to modify others of the conclusions here set forth.

GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE SETTLEMENTS.

It will be helpful, as a means of conveying an idea of the true nature of the work attempted by the early Spaniards, to present a brief sketch of the general character of these Indian settlements and of their numerical strength.

They were a people living in relatively fixed habitations, and would be classed as sedentary Indians, in contrast with roving tribes, such as the neighboring Tonkawa west of the Trinity. They subsisted to a considerable extent by agriculture, and lived, accordingly, in loosely built agricultural villages, for miles around which were detached houses, located wherever there was a spot favored by water supply and natural or easily made clearings. Their dwellings were large conical grass lodges, which accommodated several families. In all of the tribes concerning which we have relatively full data there seems to have been a main village, which the surrounding communal families regarded as their tribal headquarters. It is these central villages that I have represented on the map.

The arrangement of the settlements may be most safely learned from the accounts of some of the early eye-witnesses. Joutel tells

¹Jesus María puts the Nacogdoche tribe east and the Nacau tribe north-east of his mission. He says in another passage that the Nacao constituted a province distinct from the Aseney and thirty leagues from the Nabadache.

us, in 1687, that from the edge of the Nabadache village, west of the Neches River, to the chief's house in the middle of the settlement, it was a "large league," and that on the way there were "hamlets" of from seven to fifteen houses each, surrounded by patches of corn. From this village to that of the Neche tribe on the other side of the river it was some five leagues, but in fertile spots between them there were similar "hamlets," sometimes a league apart. So it was with the country to the northeast. When he left the Neches River at a point above the Neche village he wrote, "We pursued our route toward the east, and made about five leagues, finding from time to time cabins in 'hamlets' and 'cantons,' for we sometimes made a league and a half without finding one."¹ Between the Trinity River and the main Nabadache village De León, in 1690, encountered only one settlement. It consisted of "four farms (*haciendas*) of Indians who had planted crops of maize and beans, and very substantially built houses, with high beds to sleep on."² On the edge of the Nabadache village he "arrived at a valley occupied by many houses of Texas Indians, around which were large fields of maize, beans, calabashes, and watermelons. . . . Turning to the north by a hill of oaks, about a quarter of a league further on we came to another valley of Texas Indians, with their houses, their governor telling us that his was very near. We pitched our camp on the bank of an arroyo, and named this settlement San Francisco de los Texas."³ The "governor's" house was about half a league from the camp.

Of the country beyond the Neches Terán wrote in 1691, "We continue our march [from the Neches]. . . . The country is very rough with frequent open groves, but no openings larger than a short musket shot across. In these openings, some in the lowlands, and some in the sand, their houses are located."⁴ Joutel, in describing his passage from the lodge of one Nasoni chief to that of another, says, "Those who had escorted us went ahead and conducted us to his house, about a quarter of a league away, where his cabin was located. Before reaching it we passed several others, and on the way found women and children cultivating their

¹Relation, in Margry, *op. cit.*, 341, 344, 387.

²Derrotero, MS., entry for May 20.

³*Ibid.*, entry for May 22.

⁴Descripción y Diaria Demarcación, *op. cit.*, 48.

fields." In 1716 Ramón referred to the Hainai settlement on the Angelina River as the "pueblo of the Ainaí, where there is an infinite number of houses (*ranchos*) with their fields of corn, watermelons, melons, beans, tobacco," etc. As we have already seen, in his passage from the Hainai to the Nasoni in 1716 Espinosa noted many houses on the way.¹

After several years' residence among these tribes, Espinosa, having in mind the dismal failure to reduce them to civilized life, described the Hasinai settlements in general thus: "These natives do not live in congregations reduced to pueblos, but each of the four principal groups where the missions are located are in *ranchos* [separate houses], as it were, apart from each other. The chief cause of this is that each household seeks a place suitable for its crops and having a supply of water."² In another place he tells us that in their ministerial work among the Indians the *padres* had to travel six or seven leagues in all directions from each of the four missions.³

It is thus evident that the Hasinai settlements by no means corresponded to the Spanish notion of a pueblo, built in close order. To induce the natives to congregate in such pueblos, as a means of civilizing them, was a chief aim of the government and the missionaries, and failure to accomplish this was a primary cause of the abandonment, after fifteen years of effort, of all but one of the missions of the group.

NUMBERS.

It is easy to gain an exaggerated notion of the numerical strength of the native tribes. Popular imagination, stimulated by the hyperbole of writers for popular consumption, has peopled the primitive woods and prairies with myriads of savages. Students, however, have shown that this is an error, and that the Indian population has always been, in historical times, relatively sparse. In their efforts to counteract these exaggerated notions, they, indeed, have leaned too far in the opposite direction.

¹Joutel, in Margry, *op. cit.*, III 392; Ramón, Derrotero, in the Archivo General y Público, Mexico, entry for July 7; Espinosa, Diario, entry for July 10.

²*Crónica Apostólica*, 440 (1746).

³*Ibid.*

The Hasinai, apparently one of the most compact native populations within an equal area between the Red River and the Rio Grande, numbered only a few thousands at the coming of the Europeans. What I have already said about the nature of their villages has, perhaps, prepared the reader to believe this assertion. While our statistical information on this point does not constitute entirely conclusive evidence, it does, nevertheless, give us a basis for plausible conjecture.

The earliest estimate that might be called general is that contained in a *mémoire* of 1699, printed by Margry, and based apparently upon the report of one of the survivors of the La Salle expedition. The *mémoire* states that from "Bay Saint-Louis [Matagorda Bay] going inland to the north-northwest and the northeast there are a number of different tribes. The most numerous is the Cenys and Asenys, which, according to the opinion of a Canadian who has lived several years among them, form but one village and the same nation. He estimates that they do not exceed six hundred or seven hundred men. The Quélancouchis [Karankawa], who live on the shores of the sea about Bay Saint-Louis, are four hundred men."¹

It would seem that in this passage the term "Cenys et Asenys" corresponds closely with the term Hasinai as I have used it, unless, as is probable, the Nasoni are excluded; but, since this is not certain, the estimate, though based on long experience, would not be conclusive without corroborating testimony. This we get in 1716. Ramón tells us that the four missions founded by his expeditions, which were within easy reach of all the tribes described, "would comprise from four thousand to five thousand persons of all ages and both sexes."² In the same year Espinosa recorded in his diary his opinion that the Indians grouped around the three Querétaran missions, not including the mission among the Nacogdoche and the Nacao, would number three thousand; and after a residence there of some years he estimated the number of persons within range of each mission at about one thousand.³ This estimate must have

¹Mémoire de la Coste de la Floride et d'une partie du Mexique, in Margry, *op. cit.*, IV 316.

²Derrotero, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVII, 160.

³*Crónica Apostólica*, 439.

had a good foundation, for we are told that the *padres* kept lists of all the houses and of the persons in each.¹

Assuming that the *mémoire*, Ramón, and Espinosa include the same tribes in their estimates, it will be seen that the first is somewhat the more conservative. This fact strengthens the probability that, like other early reports, the *mémoire* did not include the Nasoni in the Hasinai.

So much for general estimates for the whole group. Detailed information concerning some of the individual tribes appears in 1721. When Aguayo in that year re-established the missions that had been abandoned some two years before, he made a general distribution of presents and clothing among the Indians at the different villages. At the mission of San Francisco de los Neches he gave the Neche chief the Spanish *baston*, token of authority, and "clothed entirely one hundred and eighty-eight men, women, and children." Never before had they received "such a general distribution." West of the Neches Aguayo had been visited by a hundred Nacono from down the river. At the mission of Concepción he requested the Hainai chief, Cheocas by name, to collect all his people. This took some time, as they were widely scattered, but several days later they were assembled, and Aguayo gave clothing and other presents to four hundred, including, possibly, eighty Kadohadachos, who happened to be there on a visit. Similarly, at the Nacogdoche mission he provided clothing "for the chief and all the rest," a total of three hundred and ninety; and at the Nasoni mission for three hundred.² This gives us a total of less than fourteen hundred Indians who came to the missions during Aguayo's *entrada* to take advantage of the ever welcome presents. This number apparently included the majority of the five most important tribes, and probably included some from the neighboring smaller tribes attached to the missions.

The conclusion is that the estimates of Ramón and Espinosa, which put the total number of inhabitants included in 1716 in the ten or more tribes about the four missions at four or five thousand are sufficiently liberal. If this conclusion is true, the tribes could not have averaged more than three or four hundred persons each.

¹*Crónica Apostólica*, 439.

²Peña, *Diario*, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 36, 39, 41, 43, 44.

The territory then occupied by perhaps four thousand Indians now supports one hundred thousand people.¹ Kept down by epidemics, crude means of getting food, and to some extent by war, the number of these natives was small. But few then, they are incomparably fewer today, for the descendants of all these tribes, now living on the reservations, do not exceed two hundred or three hundred souls.²

¹The surviving Caddo and Hasinai together numbered 551 persons in 1906 (Data given by Dr. Mooney in a communication of April 23, 1908).

²Estimate based on the United States Census for 1900.

